

## **Voices from the Trenches: Faculty Perspectives on Support for Sustaining Service-Learning**

Kristina T. Lambright and Allison F. Alden

### **Abstract**

Using data collected from three colleges, the authors examine how faculty members view the level of support for service-learning at their respective institutions. There is variation among the institutions in perceived instructor and administrator support for service-learning, availability of support services, and attitudes regarding consideration of service-learning in personnel review processes. The authors also explored the degree to which individual instructors have been able to create and sustain service-learning opportunities for their students and found important differences among the colleges. The findings have implications for efforts to sustain service-learning at both faculty and institutional levels.

### **Introduction**

Several scholars have highlighted the crucial role that faculty play in implementing and sustaining service-learning at colleges and universities (Bringle & Hatcher, 1995, 1996; Driscoll, 2000; Furco, 2002a; Holland, 1999). Because implementation of service-learning involves curricular reform, success of efforts to sustain service-learning largely depends on individual instructors (Billig, 2002; Bringle, Hatcher, & Games, 1997). In fact, a key measure used to determine the degree of service-learning institutionalization within a college or university is whether a critical number of faculty members choose to integrate service-learning into their courses (Furco, 2002b; Holland, 2006). There has been considerable interest in studying efforts to sustain service-learning programs at colleges and universities. Research has specifically examined institutional commitment to service (Ward, 1996), models for institutionalization (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996; Casey & Springer, 2006; Mercer & Brungardt, 2007), mechanisms for institutionalization and their impact on community partners (Stater & Fotheringham, 2009; Stoecker & Tryon, 2009), institutional support structures (Hinck & Brandell, 2000), and organizational factors influencing the institutionalization of service-learning (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Holland, 1997). Faculty members' views on service-learning sustainability, however, are not as well understood.

Using data from three colleges, the authors build on existing research and offer insights on faculty perspectives regarding service-learning's sustainability. This investigation examined how faculty members view the level of support for service-learning at their institutions. Also explored is the degree to which individual instructors at the three colleges have been able to create and sustain service-learning. Finally, the implications of the investigation's findings for efforts to sustain service-learning at the institutional and faculty levels are considered.

### **Service-Learning Sustainability and Innovation Adoption**

The term "sustainability" has been used extensively within the literature on service-learning. The service-learning literature offers few attempts to define sustainability either conceptually or operationally; however, according to Billig (2002),

Sustainability is similar to institutionalization and typically refers to an innovation that endures over time. Sustainability often involves the ability to maintain or increase program efforts by building constituencies; creating strong, enduring partnerships; generating and leveraging resources; and identifying and securing funding sources that are available over time. (*p. 247*)

Today, in service-learning literature, sustainability has become nearly synonymous with *institutionalization* (Billig, 2002). Most discussions focus on the degree to which different forms of community engagement, including service-learning, are valued by universities and how they are integrated into institutions (*e.g., Butin, 2006; Cuban & Anderson, 2007; Kramer, 2000*). When distinctions are made in the literature between institutionalization and sustainability, the former requires formal organizational structures, while the latter can involve both formal and informal activities (Billig, 2002). The investigation reported in this article focused on sustainability, recognizing that a faculty member's service-learning efforts may or may not be associated with any formal organizational structures or initiatives.

As highlighted in her definition of service-learning sustainability, Billig (2002), like other scholars in the service-learning literature (McKay & Rozee, 2004; Zlotkowski, 2000), views the adoption of service-learning as an instructional innovation. Drawing on the more general literature on innovations in higher education,

an “instructional innovation” may be defined as any change in teaching practice that, “although it may have been tried before in other settings, is new to the individual or group directly involved in the innovation process” (*Lane, 2001, p. 14*). Faculty enjoy considerable autonomy within their own classrooms (*Ikenberry, 1972*), so decisions to use instructional innovations are largely made by individual instructors. In order for service-learning to be sustainable at the campus level, individual instructors must demonstrate a commitment to using this instructional innovation.

Kozma (1985) identifies several characteristics of instructional innovations in higher education that offer a framework for understanding service-learning as an instructional innovation. Three key characteristics that Kozma has recognized included that: (1) most instructional innovations are not adopted; (2) instructional innovations reflect the attitudes and beliefs of the adopting faculty; and (3) instructional innovations require time and support to be effectively implemented. Studies examining the adoption of a variety of instructional innovations offer empirical support for these characteristics (*Clark, 1993; Foertsch, Millar, Squire, & Gunter, 1997; Friedman, 1982; Penberthy & Millar, 2002*). In the next section, the authors draw on the service-learning literature to apply the characteristics of instructional innovations as identified by Kozma. The goal was to better understand the context for faculty efforts to sustain service-learning.

### **Understanding the Context for Faculty Efforts to Sustain Service-Learning**

Consistent with Kozma’s (1985) assertion that adoption of instructional innovation is atypical, there is evidence that the number of faculty adopting service-learning is still limited. According to Campus Compact’s 2009 annual membership survey, an average of 6% of member institutions’ corps of faculty offered service-learning courses (*Campus Compact, 2009*). Moreover, respondents in a survey of 105 Campus Compact institutional members reported that both campus administrators and students “value” service-learning more than faculty do (*Hinck & Brandell, 2000*). Similarly, in her case study of five higher education institutions in Montana, Ward (1996) found that senior administrators tended to be more supportive of service-learning initiatives than faculty members.

Applying another characteristic identified by Kozma (1985), faculty attitudes and beliefs often influence whether they will implement service-learning. Faculty members adopting service-learning

frequently believe this innovation improves student learning, benefits the community, and helps them fulfill their professional responsibilities (Abes, Jackson, & Jones, 2002; Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007; McKay & Rozee, 2004). Faculty identify student learning outcomes as the most important reason among these beliefs motivating them to adopt service-learning (Abes et al., 2002; Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007).

Corresponding to the third characteristic of instructional innovations identified by Kozma (1985), time and support are needed in order to effectively implement service-learning. Barriers hindering faculty efforts to implement and sustain service-learning include concerns relating to time, logistics, and funding (Abes et al., 2002; Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007; Holland, 1999; Stanton, 1994 Ward, 1996). Faculty must spend considerable time forming community partnerships, recruiting students, and managing course curricula. Release time to develop service-learning courses offers a mechanism for addressing time management concerns (Abes et al., 2002) and can serve as an incentive for a faculty member to use service-learning. Funding is another important incentive and is needed to pay for the direct costs of service-learning projects (e.g., travel, preparation of professional materials; Ward, 1996).

In addition, support by campus personnel has been identified as a key resource for encouraging faculty members to engage in service-learning activities (Forbes, Wasburn, Crispo, & Vandeveer, 2008). For instance, campus support services, including centralized offices (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996, 2000; Bringle et al., 1997), can assist faculty in managing the logistical challenges of service-learning. Another source of support is encouragement from campus administrators. The value campus administrators place on service-learning is positively associated with the value faculty place on service-learning (Hinck & Brandell, 2000). The support that faculty members receive from other faculty members is also critical (Abes et al., 2002; Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007; Bringle et al., 1997). The first generation of faculty adopting service-learning at an institution can help recruit a second generation of faculty by participating in faculty development activities, by writing about their experiences in a disciplinary monograph or journal, and by making service-learning a focus of their research (Bringle et al., 1997). Ideally, the adoption of service-learning will be a self-perpetuating process with the initial adoption of service-learning by core faculty on a campus facilitating the subsequent adoption of service-learning by other campus faculty (McKay & Rozee, 2004).

Finally, personnel review processes that value service-learning are an important source of support (Bringle et al., 1997; Holland, 1997;

*Levine, 1994).* Unfortunately, on many campuses, instruction is not weighted as heavily as scholarship and publication in personnel review processes (*Hannan & Silver, 2000; Lane, 2001; Tierney, 1997*). Faculty members are often actively discouraged from investing their time in a new instructional method (*Foertsch et al., 1997; Hannan & Silver, 2000; Lane, 2001; Tierney, 1997*). Consistent with this, one of the most widely identified barriers to faculty use of service-learning is the lack of rewards and recognition for this method within personnel review processes (*Abes et al., 2002; Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007; Forbes et al., 2008; Holland, 1999; Ward, 1996*). However, recent empirical evidence suggests that a tenure and promotion process may not deter as many faculty from engaging in service-learning as scholars previously believed (*Abes et al., 2002; Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007*). Abes et al. (2002) specifically found that only faculty at research universities viewed lack of recognition for service-learning in personnel review processes as a deterrent.

### **Research Method**

The purpose of this study was to learn about service-learning sustainability from a faculty perspective. The authors examined how faculty members view the level of support for service-learning at their respective institutions by focusing on formal and informal sources, including

- the institutional context for service-learning;
- incentives for using service-learning;
- instructor support, administrative support, availability of support services; and
- the value placed on service-learning in personnel review processes.

Also explored was the degree to which individual instructors were able to create and sustain service-learning opportunities for their students.

To answer the research questions, the authors studied three colleges located in the northeastern United States. These institutions were selected because of their ongoing collaboration on projects funded by Campus Compact. The names of the three colleges have been changed in order to protect the confidentiality of the institutions and study participants. The colleges varied in their size, student population, mission, and culture. College A is a publicly funded doctoral research university, College B is a community college, and College C is a small, private Christian college. Table 1 summarizes key characteristics of the three colleges.

**Table I. Summary of Key College Characteristics**

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>College A</b>	<b>College B</b>	<b>College C</b>
<b>Number of instructors</b>	889	418	35
<b>Number of students</b>	14,668	6,625	310
<b>% of graduate students</b>	20	0	0
<b>% of Caucasian students</b>	44	87	87
<b>% of full-time students</b>	93	64	70
<b>% of in-state students</b>	80	91	80

The close proximity of the three colleges within a small city has greatly influenced the degree to which they have communicated and collaborated. Many faculty members at College B received at least part of their education at College A. In addition, some College B adjunct instructors have full-time employment at College A, and a number of College B faculty members and administrators serve as adjunct instructors at College A. All three institutions have co-sponsored community activities.

The three college partners collaborated on three funded grants sponsored by Campus Compact. The first two grants focused on increasing the number of faculty members teaching service-learning courses, increasing the number of students engaged in community-based learning, and building the capacity to support these efforts on the three campuses. Grant funds supported faculty seminars on service-learning, access to conferences, and service-learning mentoring. The third grant funded the investigation reported in this article. The authors of this article co-directed the third project and participated in activities of the first two grants.

### **Data Collection and Analysis Methods**

The data sources used in this study included a survey of instructors, interviews with campus administrators and instructors, and printed and electronic documents. Institutional review board approval was obtained for the data collection protocol. In the data collection process, the authors primarily focused on learning about individual instructors' views and experiences. This information was then aggregated to assess service-learning sustainability on the three campuses from a faculty perspective.

Using a modified version of the service-learning definition developed by Abes et al. (2002), this study defined service-learning as a form of experiential education in which students participated in an organized service activity that meets identified off-campus

community needs and is connected to course content and specific learning outcomes with structured reflection during class time. This definition was provided to all survey and interview participants.

### **Survey of instructors.**

The survey utilized closed-ended questions. Instructors were asked to indicate their level of agreement on a Likert scale with statements relating to

- their attitudes toward service-learning;
- the extent to which instructors in their department, instructors outside their department, and campus administrators were supportive of service-learning;
- the availability of support services and funding for service-learning; and
- the value placed on service-learning in personnel review processes.

In addition, instructors answered questions about aspects of their implementation of service-learning, such as

- the number of times they had taught a semester-long class with a service-learning component;
- the type of service-learning courses they had taught;
- the number of service-learning projects that they had been involved with that lasted two or more semesters;
- the number of community organizations they had partnered with and the roles that their community partners had played in their service-learning projects;
- the receipt of release time and/or funding to support their service-learning activities;
- the relevance of service-learning to their research agenda; and
- the factors that would encourage them to continue using service-learning.

### **The survey instrument sample.**

The administrators, staff, and faculty members familiar with service-learning policy and practices on all three campuses were asked to identify instructors who they knew had used or were

using service-learning as a teaching technique. In total, 52 service-learning instructors were identified: 31 at College A, 15 at College B, and 6 at College C. In the first electronic survey wave at Colleges A and B, instructors in the service-learning sample were asked to provide the names of other instructors they knew were currently teaching or had taught service-learning courses. Instructors in the service-learning sample at College C were not asked to do this because all six of College C's full-time instructors were identified as using service-learning. An additional seven instructors were identified as using service-learning at College A through this snowball sampling technique, and they were sent surveys. The survey was also sent to 92 randomly selected instructors at Colleges A and B in order to assess whether more instructors were using service-learning than were initially identified.

In total, 151 surveys were distributed via e-mail, and 84 usable surveys were received (46 from the service-learning sample and 38 from the random sample), representing an overall response rate of 56%. Seven instructors in the random sample at College A and four instructors in the random sample from College B indicated that they had taught at least one course with a service-learning component. The responses of these 11 instructors were added to the service-learning instructors sample for data analysis. The responses of the other instructors from the random sample were excluded. In summary, data analysis was based on characteristics of 57 survey respondents.

The survey revealed several key characteristics of the respondents who had taught at least one service-learning course:

- 63% were female;
- 77% were Caucasian;
- 53% were tenured, 33% were untenured and not on a tenure track, and the remaining 14% were untenured and on a tenure track;
- the respondents had been teaching in higher education for an average of 16 years; and
- nearly 30% belonged to a department within the social and behavioral sciences; the remainder (approximately 70%) taught in other disciplines.

**Table 2. Comparison of the Characteristics of the Study Sample and Instructor Population by Institution**

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>College A</b>		<b>College B</b>		<b>College C</b>	
	<b>Study Sample</b>	<b>Instructor Population</b>	<b>Study Sample</b>	<b>Instructor Population</b>	<b>Study Sample</b>	<b>Instructor Population</b>
<b>% (Number) Female</b>	65% (24)	41% (366)	56% (9)	47% (197)	60% (3)	50% (3)
<b>% (Number) Caucasian</b>	75% (27)	79% (706)	81% (13)	93% (388)	80% (4)	83% (5)
<b>% (Number) Tenured/Tenure Track</b>	70% (25)	55% (490)	81% (13)	31% (130)	0% 0	0% 0
<b>% (Number) Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences</b>	25% (9)	18% (164)	31% (5)	18% (76)	40% (2)	33% (2)

### **Interviews with campus administrators and instructors.**

Two sets of interviews were conducted. First, key individuals who had administrative responsibilities and were familiar with service-learning structures, practices, and policies at their respective institutions were interviewed. In addition to having administrative responsibilities, 5 of the 14 individuals also instructed service-learning courses. Participants in these interviews were asked about faculty implementation of service-learning; faculty incentives for engaging in service-learning; centralized support capacity; the strategic plan and goals for advancing service-learning; service-learning's relationship to other campus-wide efforts; and the institutionalization of service-learning on their campus. Interview questions were based on Furco's (2002b) rubric for assessing the institutionalization of service-learning in higher education. In total, 14 individuals participated in the first set of interviews.

The second set of interviews was conducted with 8 instructors who had been identified during the first set of interviews as providing campus leadership for service-learning. Interviewees were from a variety of disciplines and included instructors who taught primarily undergraduate students, as well as instructors at College A who taught primarily graduate students. Interviewees were asked about faculty implementation of service-learning; faculty incentives for engaging in service-learning; the extent to which instructors in their department, instructors outside their department, and campus administrators were supportive of service-learning; the relevance of service-learning to their research agenda;

the role of their community partners in their service-learning projects; and their plans to use service-learning in the future.

### **The interview process.**

At the beginning of the 45-minute interviews, confidentiality was guaranteed. The interviews were audio recorded, transcribed, and coded. Initial codes were developed based on the questions included in the two interview protocols. This list of codes was then revised and augmented through an inductive process based on analysis of the interview transcripts. Detailed definitions of each code were developed in order to ensure consistent usage. Coded interview data was analyzed using QSR NVivo v. 7.0. Both memoing (*Miles & Huberman, 1994*) and pattern-matching (*Yin, 2009*) were used as part of the data analysis process.

### **Document analysis.**

A document analysis was conducted on print and electronic documents at the three colleges. Documents were collected through searches of each institution's website. Interviewers also asked participants in the first set of interviews to identify documents and websites that provided information about service-learning and other forms of experiential education at their respective campuses. Examples of documents reviewed included strategic plans, mission statements, annual reports, committee descriptions and minutes, personnel review process guidelines, and personnel procedures. The authors used the documents to assess the extent to which the three colleges had formal policies specific to service-learning or formalized plans for achieving campus-wide goals related to service-learning.

## **Findings**

The findings examine how faculty members view the level of support for service-learning at their respective institutions and explore the extent to which service-learning has been sustained at the three colleges. According to the findings, the level of support for service-learning activities as perceived by faculty was quite similar in some respects across the campuses, but differed in others. On all three campuses, there were minimal financial incentives and limited opportunities for course releases. On the other hand, perceptions regarding instructor support, administrative support, availability of support services, and the value placed on service-learning in personnel review processes varied. There was

also variation in the extent to which service-learning had been sustained at the three colleges. This section begins with descriptions of the institutional contexts for service-learning at all three institutions. Following this, the perceived level of support for service-learning activities at each institution is detailed in the following areas: incentives for using service-learning, instructor support, administrative support, availability of support services, and the value of service-learning in personnel review processes. This section concludes by discussing the extent to which individual faculty members at the three institutions have been able to create and sustain service-learning opportunities for their students. The key findings are summarized in Table 3. Both the survey and interview data were considered when making the rating determinations in Table 3.

**Table 3. Perceptions of Current Supports for Service-Learning by Institution**

	<b>College A</b>	<b>College B</b>	<b>College C</b>
<b>Availability of Financial Incentives</b>	Limited (supported primarily by external funding)	Limited (supported primarily by external funding)	Limited (supported primarily by external funding)
<b>Availability of Course Releases</b>	Limited (supported primarily by external funding)	Very limited (supported by institutional resources)	Not available
<b>Instructor Support</b>	Moderately positive within departments/ limited outside departments	Strongly positive within departments/ moderately positive outside departments	Strongly positive
<b>Administrative Support</b>	Moderately positive	Moderately positive	Strongly positive
<b>Availability of Support Services</b>	Moderate	Moderate	Limited (but available services highly valued)
<b>Value of Service-Learning in Personnel Review Processes</b>	Valued negatively/ neutral	Neutral	Neutral

### **The institutional context.**

College A is a publicly funded doctoral research university with approximately 11,500 undergraduate and 3,000 graduate students. It was the only institution with considerable research expectations for tenure-track and tenured faculty. Service-learning had been implemented for several years, but only a small number of instructors had used it. In a few departments, a number of instructors used it, while in most departments, service-learning was limited.

Based on the size of the sample for this study's survey, approximately 5% of instructors were involved in service-learning at College A. However, the percentage of instructors who were involved in service-learning may have been higher, given that 7 out of the 26 respondents in the randomly selected non-service-learning sample indicated that they had taught at least one semester-long course with a service-learning component.

A handful of campus staff performed some tasks supporting instructor service-learning efforts, in addition to their other responsibilities. These staff worked for different programs in various campus locations, and there was little coordination among these programs. As described by one interviewee,

There's no official rule that everybody has to go through this person, and I would say there are pieces of this [service-learning] all over campus. Like there's a person that's supposed to coordinate service-learning, there's a person that coordinates volunteer efforts, there's a person that coordinates internships, there's a person with a title that is coordinator of experiential education. And they're all in different departments and they all do a specific piece.

Interviewees indicated that a significant percentage of campus service-learning activities were not filtered through any of the campus programs tasked with supporting instructor service-learning efforts. This is consistent with our observation in the sampling process that service-learning leaders at College A appear to be unaware of a significant portion of the faculty using service-learning on their campus. Interviewees also reported that staff charged with some responsibility to support service-learning had very little, if any, authority to influence the advancement of service-learning on the campus.

Serving over 6,000 students, College B is a community college. As at College A, instructors had been using service-learning for several years, and there were small pockets of faculty involved in service-learning scattered throughout the campus. In the words of one administrator, "They're very individually committed people. But they're all over our campus." Based on the size of the sample for this study's survey, approximately 4% of instructors were involved in service-learning at College B. However, the percentage of instructors who were involved in service-learning may have been higher, given that 4 out of the 12 respondents in the randomly selected

non-service-learning sample indicated that they had taught at least one semester-long course with a service-learning component.

There was minimal coordination of campus service-learning activities. One faculty member received 6 hours of release time per week to coordinate civic engagement activities. He still taught nine credit hours per semester and spent just 5% to 10% of his time coordinating service-learning and other community engagement activities. Otherwise, there was no campus coordinating agent or support staff for service-learning at College B.

College C is a private Christian college. It is considerably smaller than either College A or B, with approximately 300 students. Unlike Colleges A and B, where faculty had used service-learning for many years, College C had adopted it only within the last 2 years. Full-time instructors had enthusiastically embraced this innovation, and all six had used service-learning. Part-time instructors had not yet integrated service-learning into their classes, but there was an interest among administrators in encouraging them to do so. Service was integral to the mission of College C as a Bible college, which may help explain the rapid diffusion of service-learning among full-time faculty. In the words of an instructor,

We've basically just been encouraged, especially to think about our educational goals and the fact that this [service-learning] fits with who we are trying to be as an institution, that trains people to think beyond themselves, that trains people to think about how we can help systems and individuals and families in our society. . . . So it's really been encouraged along the lines of a value to us given our mission as an institution.

Based on the document analysis, none of the three institutions had formal policies specific to service-learning or formalized plans for achieving campus-wide goals related to service-learning. Also as evidenced by the interviews and document analysis, there were no campus-wide mechanisms at the three institutions for monitoring the quality or quantity of service-learning.

### **Incentives for using service-learning.**

The incentives for instructors to engage in service-learning activities at all three institutions were primarily intrinsic rather than extrinsic. Only 41% of survey respondents had received any funding to support their service-learning activities, and just 12% had received release time. Consistent with this, only a handful

of survey respondents agreed that campus funding for service-learning activities is available, as illustrated in Table 4. Table 4 details the level of agreement survey respondents expressed in response to several statements regarding campus support for service-learning. Response information is broken down by institution.

**Table 4. Survey Results Regarding Perceptions of Current Supports for Service-Learning Efforts by Institution**

	College A	College B	College C
<b>Campus funding for Service-learning activities is available.</b>			
% (number) disagree/strongly disagree	31.4% (11)	56.3% (9)	40.0% (2)
% (number) neither agree nor disagree	51.4% (18)	31.3% (5)	40.0% (2)
% (number) agree/strongly agree	17.1% (6)	12.5% (2)	20.0% (1)
	99.9% total	100.1% total	
<b>Other instructors in my department are supportive of service-learning.</b>			
% (number) disagree/strongly disagree	11.1% (4)	6.3% (1)	0% (0)
% (number) neither agree nor disagree	27.8% (10)	18.8% (3)	20.0% (1)
% (number) agree/strongly agree	61.1% (22)	75.0% (12)	80.0% (4)
	100.1% total	100.1% total	
<b>Other instructors outside my department are supportive of service-learning.</b>			
% (number) disagree/strongly disagree	5.6% (2)	6.3% (1)	0% (0)
% (number) neither agree nor disagree	55.6% (20)	31.3% (5)	0% (0)
% (number) agree/strongly agree	38.9% (14)	62.5% (10)	100% (5)
	100.1% total	100.1% total	
<b>Campus administrators are supportive of service-learning.</b>			
% (number) disagree/strongly disagree	8.3% (3)	12.6% (2)	0% (0)
% (number) neither agree nor disagree	30.6% (11)	43.8% (7)	0% (0)
% (number) agree/strongly agree	61.1% (22)	43.8% (7)	100% (5)
	100.2% total	100.2% total	
<b>Support services for instructors interested in service-learning are available on this campus.</b>			
% (number) disagree/strongly disagree	20.0% (7)	33.3% (5)	0% (0)
% (number) neither agree nor disagree	40.0% (14)	26.7% (4)	0% (0)
% (number) agree/strongly agree	40.0% (14)	40.0% (6)	100% (5)
<b>Service-learning activities are valued in performance reviews and/or the tenure and promotion process on this campus.</b>			
% (number) disagree/strongly disagree	47.2% (17)	18.8% (3)	0% (0)
% (number) neither agree nor disagree	41.7% (15)	56.3% (9)	75.0% (3)
% (number) agree/strongly agree	11.1% (4)	25.0% (4)	25.0% (1)
	100.1% total	100.1% total	

Respondents indicated the extent to which they agreed with the statements above.

Note: Totals may differ from 100% due to rounding.

Although only limited funding and release time was available, more than three-fifths of the survey respondents at each institution indicated that both of these incentives would encourage them to continue to use service-learning, as shown in Table 5. Survey respondents were asked to rate the level of their agreement with statements describing different factors that would encourage them to continue to use service-learning. The results to this series of questions are reported in Table 5 and, as in Table 4, response information is broken down by institution.

**Table 5. Survey Results Regarding Perceptions of Current Supports for Service-Learning Efforts by Institution**

	College A	College B	College C
<b>Funding to support service-learning activities.</b>			
% (number) disagree/strongly disagree	5.6% (2)	12.6% (2)	0% (0)
% (number) neither agree nor disagree	16.7% (6)	18.8% (3)	0% (0)
% (number) agree/strongly agree	77.8% (28)	68.8% (11)	100% (5)
	99.1% total	100.2% total	
<b>Release time to support service-learning activities.</b>			
% (number) disagree/strongly disagree	8.3% (3)	20.0% (3)	0% (0)
% (number) neither agree nor disagree	30.6% (11)	13.3% (2)	0% (0)
% (number) agree/strongly agree	61.1% (22)	66.7% (10)	100% (3)
<b>Support from other instructors in my department.</b>			
% (number) disagree/strongly disagree	5.6% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)
% (number) neither agree nor disagree	33.3% (12)	56.3% (9)	40.0% (2)
% (number) agree/strongly agree	61.1% (22)	43.8% (7)	60.0% (3)
	100.1% total		
<b>Support from instructors outside my department.</b>			
% (number) disagree/strongly disagree	8.3% (3)	0% (0)	0% (0)
% (number) neither agree nor disagree	55.6% (2)	68.8% (11)	0% (0)
% (number) agree/strongly agree	36.1% (13)	31.3% (5)	100% (5)
	100.1% total		
<b>Support from campus administrators</b>			
% (number) disagree/strongly disagree	5.7% (2)	6.3% (1)	0% (0)
% (number) neither agree nor disagree	25.7% (9)	18.8% (3)	0% (0)
% (number) agree/strongly agree	68.5% (24)	75.0% (12)	100% (5)
	99.9% total	100.1% total	
<b>Campus support services for instructors interested in service-learning.</b>			
% (number) disagree/strongly disagree	5.7% (2)	6.3% (1)	0% (0)
% (number) neither agree nor disagree	31.4% (11)	18.8% (3)	0% (0)
% (number) agree/strongly agree	62.9% (22)	75.0% (12)	100% (5)
	100.1% total		
<b>Consideration of service-learning in performance reviews and/or tenure &amp; promotion process</b>			
% (number) disagree/strongly disagree	8.6% (3)	12.5% (2)	0% (0)
% (number) neither agree nor disagree	31.4% (11)	31.3% (5)	25% (1)
% (number) agree/strongly agree	60.0% (21)	56.3% (9)	75% (3)
	100.1% total		

Respondents indicated the extent to which they agreed the following factors would encourage them to continue to use service-learning.

Note: Totals may differ from 100% due to rounding.

Instead of initially being motivated by financial incentives or release time, 10 of the interviewees reported that instructors became involved in service-learning because of its educational value. Instructors believed that their students benefit from the opportunity to apply course knowledge in a real-life setting. As described by one instructor,

I think it's [service-learning is] so valuable for the students. In any service based profession it is one thing to have knowledge, but to have the skills and disposition to be good at it and to sustain it is something that I don't believe they can learn in a classroom. I think they have to be embedded, they have to see why these are crucial elements.

Five interviewees also reported that instructors become engaged in service-learning activities in order to benefit the community. In the words of one of the instructors interviewed,

I am completely committed to this community. I chose to move back here as an adult after living somewhere else, to say no, this is the place where family, education, it all comes together. So I feel really committed to helping this community.

Consistent with comments in the interviews:

- 95% of survey respondents agreed or strongly agreed that service-learning was a valuable pedagogical tool,
- 91% of survey respondents agreed or strongly agreed that it was important for students on their campus to participate in service-learning,
- 77% of survey respondents agreed or strongly agreed that it was important for students in their discipline to participate in service-learning, and
- 96% of survey respondents agreed or strongly agreed it was important for colleges and universities to work with communities to help them solve problems.

### **Instructor support.**

Instructors at Colleges B and C generally felt other instructors supported their service-learning activities. Attitudes were more mixed at College A, as shown in Table 4. More than three-fifths of survey respondents at each institution believed that instructors within their departments were supportive of service-learning. Slightly more than 60% of instructors surveyed at College B and all instructors surveyed at College C believed that instructors outside their department were supportive of service-learning. On the other hand, less than 40% of instructors surveyed at College A viewed instructors outside their departments as supportive. According to one instructor from College A,

I don't think we have a real good infrastructure for faculty to really . . . share ideas about what works and what doesn't work. So I haven't had any formal contact or informal contact really, with other faculty about the service-learning projects outside of our college [in the university]. Within the college, yes, but not beyond [to the university].

The small Campus Compact grants helped facilitate the development of informal mentoring systems among instructors at Colleges B and C, which were sustained even after grant funding ended. These mentoring systems provided instructors new to service-learning the opportunity to learn about this method, receive advice on how to structure projects, and brainstorm solutions to problems they were experiencing. Furthermore, one interviewee at College C indicated that the informal mentoring system helped facilitate the spread of service-learning on his campus. As described by this instructor, "I think from colleague to colleague we've talked about how we've implemented these ideas . . . so it [service-learning] just has spread because we've shared in these discussions together." In contrast, though mentors were also assigned to interested faculty at College A, a comparable sustained informal mentoring system did not develop as a result of Campus Compact funding.

Four interviewees indicated that having a mentor would be extremely valuable for instructors new to service-learning. One instructor commented,

I think the best advice I could give was have somebody experienced there to help you problem solve

along the way. I think it [implementing service-learning for the first time] can seem overwhelming. . . . a lot of it is just putting the pieces together. And once it's in place, I think you find the success with it.

While having a mentor was highlighted in many interviews as useful for new service-learning instructors, instructor support, particularly from those outside the department, may not necessarily play a critical role in encouraging instructors to continue to use service-learning. At College B, less than a third of survey respondents indicated that support from other instructors in their department would encourage them to sustain service-learning efforts, as shown in Table 5. In addition, less than 40% of respondents at Colleges A and B agreed that support from instructors outside their department would encourage them to continue to use service-learning.

### **Administrative support.**

Perceptions of administrative support for service-learning varied across the three campuses. College C administrators were perceived as the most supportive. Reflecting this, all College C survey respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that campus administrators were supportive of service-learning, as indicated in Table 4. In addition to interviewees' general belief that there was administrative support, one senior administrator in particular was viewed as a champion for service-learning at College C. He initiated College C's involvement with Colleges A and B on the Campus Compact projects. He also individually recruited and strongly encouraged instructors to try service-learning, providing personalized encouragement and initial guidance. According to another administrator from College C, this senior administrator "has been the driving force behind all this [service-learning]."

Perceptions of administrative support for service-learning were more moderate at College A. Reflecting this, approximately 60% of College A survey respondents indicated that campus administrators were supportive of service-learning, as illustrated in Table 4. Several interviewees reported that senior administrators were publicly supportive of service-learning activities and had given service recognition awards for these activities. In addition, a question on service-learning had recently been added to the provost's annual faculty report. However, a number of interviewees also noted that sustaining service-learning efforts had not been a high priority for

senior administrators. In the words of one senior administrator, this reflects

the ambivalence [senior administrators] feel about pulling faculty away from their primary research obligations. To the extent that we were using our resources to lure our faculty away from their research activities . . . if we were rewarding them financially or any other way, course reductions or whatever, for doing service-learning . . . [senior administrators] fear that they would then not get tenure or if they were already tenured that they would cease to be making the desired . . . contribution to our mission as a research university.

College B administrators were perceived as the least supportive. According to Table 4, only 44% of College B survey respondents agreed that campus administrators were supportive of service-learning. Although a few past and current administrators were verbally supportive, there had not been any successful administrative efforts to sustain service-learning at College B. Adding to uncertainty about administrator priorities, several high-level administrators had left College B recently, and the individuals filling these positions had been appointed on an interim basis. In describing the current environment at College B, one interviewee commented,

Some of the deans are in interim positions. And they're saying, "How can we do anything until things are clear?" . . . Some people who are in an interim position . . . believe in it [service-learning] but they also have to find out what's going to happen once the new administration is in place.

Although the level of administrative support varied by institution, there was general agreement that support from campus administrators can serve as a key source of encouragement for faculty using service-learning. Based on the data reported in Table 5, more than two-thirds of survey respondents indicated that support from campus administrators would encourage them to continue to use service-learning. This finding was consistent across all three institutions.

### **Support services.**

Colleges A and B offered a moderate level of support services; support services were more limited at College C. According to Table 4, 40% of College A survey respondents indicated that

support services for instructors interested in service-learning are available. At College A, a few instructors had received training as part of the Campus Compact projects. In addition, campus offices had occasionally sponsored workshops on service-learning. College A was the only institution where any campus staff had responsibilities related to supporting instructor service-learning efforts. But as noted, the efforts of these staff persons were not well coordinated. Several interviewees indicated that instructors were often unaware of available support services. One interviewee from College A commented,

I think they [support services at College A] are fragmented plus there's big gaps. . . . For instance if you're a student and you want to do a service-learning course . . . where do you go? If you're a faculty and you want to do a service-learning course . . . who do you go to? It's not outlined in a scheduled manner where . . . people know exactly what steps they have to take so it's very fragmented and . . . a lot of pieces are missing.

A few College B faculty had also participated in trainings funded by Campus Compact, and the campus office responsible for providing instructional support had periodically offered service-learning workshops. Though not centralized, the informal mentoring networks that had emerged at College B as a result of the Campus Compact projects provided another source of support. As at College A, 40% of College B survey respondents believed service-learning support services were available on their campus (Table 4).

Of the three institutions, College C offered the most modest level of support services. The only support services cited in the interviews were the handful of trainings funded by the Campus Compact grants and the informal mentoring networks emerging among instructors. Despite the limited nature of support services, all College C survey respondents agreed that service-learning support services were available on their campus, as shown in Table 4. These findings suggest that available support services, although not extensive, were viewed as extremely valuable. The informal mentoring networks may have been especially effective at College C because of the campus's small size. In the words of one instructor,

Being a small college has its advantages. And that's one of them . . . we do share a lot. We share a heartbeat and a

passion for the work that we do. And we're close enough to each other that we can share a lot of ideas, a lot of encouragement to try some new things.

The support services available at all three institutions, particularly those involving coordination of service-learning activities, could be expanded. Our survey results suggest that further investments in support services could help sustain service-learning efforts. More than 60% of survey respondents at each institution indicated that availability of campus support services would encourage them to use service-learning in the future, as shown in Table 5.

### **Personnel review processes.**

Reflecting their different missions, the three institutions emphasized different activities in their personnel review processes. Colleges B and C focused on teaching, while College A focused on research activities. As evidenced by the document analysis and interviews, none of the institutions addressed service-learning in personnel review policies.

Opinions regarding the value of service-learning in personnel review processes varied. Most interviewees at Colleges B and C either (1) were unsure how service-learning was considered or (2) believed it was not seriously considered in personnel review processes. One instructor from College B who did not believe service-learning activities were seriously considered at his college commented, "Nothing has ever been embedded in any protocols that would suggest that either a tenure recommendation or a promotion application would be influenced by your having done any service-learning." Consistent with interview findings, Table 4 indicates approximately 56% of College B survey respondents and 75% of College C survey respondents neither agreed nor disagreed that service-learning activities are valued in personnel review processes.

Instructor attitudes regarding the value of service-learning in personnel review processes were more negative at College A. Like instructors at Colleges B and C, many College A instructors were neutral regarding the value of service-learning in personnel review processes. But unlike those at the other two institutions, almost half of College A survey respondents disagreed that service-learning activities were valued, as shown in Table 4. The greater prevalence of negative attitudes may reflect that College A was the only institution with considerable research expectations for tenure-track and tenured faculty. Several interviewees indicated

that service-learning results in instructors having less time to spend on research, which discourages instructors at College A from getting involved in service-learning activities. According to one instructor at College A,

It takes a lot of time and energy to coordinate with community agencies, to know your community, to be out in your community. It takes a lot of time and energy to help students get the knowledge that they need to function effectively in the community. And I think that those skills are not rewarded by the university. . . . They reward research. . . . If you have a system where it's [service-learning is] really well integrated then it would be easy to research it and publish it and fulfill university expectations. But unless you can figure out how to integrate that yourself, there's nobody on the campus that's helping you do that.

Capturing the same sentiments, another College A instructor reported,

When I was serving on the university personnel committee, there were cases that would come up when a faculty member was really contributing a lot of time . . . to different kinds of service-learning activities. And the general discussion on those candidacies often focused on needing to shift their attention from that kind of work to more traditional teaching and research activity. So there was really a community sense on that committee that people who engage in service-learning in a big way were really taking away time from the activities that they should have been focusing on.

When asked what advice she would give an instructor new to service-learning, one College A instructor bluntly replied that she would tell them to avoid service-learning if their goal was to become a tenured faculty member at College A. This instructor indicated that she had decided to take a non-tenure-track position in order to avoid worrying that she would not be able to meet the university's research expectations. In fact, 86% of survey respondents from College A were either not in a tenure-track position or had already received tenure.

The study findings suggest that consideration of service-learning in personnel review processes can influence whether

faculty sustain service-learning efforts. As shown in Table 5, a majority of those surveyed from all three institutions indicated that consideration of service-learning in personnel review processes would encourage them to continue using service-learning.

### **Service-learning sustainability.**

Community partners played a sustained, vibrant role in service-learning at all three institutions. More than 75% of survey respondents at each institution indicated that community partners have had input in the development and implementation of their service-learning projects. Based on the interviews, the specific responsibilities of community partners varied according to the service-learning project's content. For example, one of the interviewees had her students serve as mentors to at-risk youth. In this case, the community partner identified the at-risk youth, helped match the youth with mentors, and developed a schedule for the mentors. Another interviewee who taught management classes had her students act as consultants to different community organizations. Community partners involved in these initiatives helped the student consultant teams with project selection and oversaw the teams. The majority of survey respondents at each institution also indicated that community partners have provided them with feedback about their projects and that they have maintained communication with community partners following project completion.

Although most survey respondents reported that community partners actively participated in their service-learning projects, community partners were not necessarily closely involved in course instruction. The level of involvement of community partners as course instructors varied considerably across the three institutions. At College C, 80% of survey respondents regarded community partners as co-instructors, while less than half of the survey respondents at both Colleges A and B believed that their community partners played this role. One of the instructors interviewed from College A specifically indicated that he was interested in having community partners play a more active role in the classroom and commented,

What I would love to do is involve community partners in the classroom as part of the education experience so that there would be a real breakdown of students versus community partners and where the whole activity would be one of engagement and quality between students, community partners, and the faculty member.

Two other interviewees reported that they would like to develop more formalized mechanisms for community partners to provide feedback about their experiences with service-learning projects in order to deepen the partners' involvement.

In addition to providing information on the role community partners play in service-learning projects, the survey offers insights into the depth of instructor involvement in service-learning activities at the three institutions. Although only a small percentage of all faculty members were currently involved in service-learning at Colleges A and B, the survey results indicated that these individual instructors have demonstrated a sustained commitment to service-learning. The majority of survey respondents from Colleges A and B had taught a semester-long class with a service-learning component four or more times and had partnered with at least four community organizations as part of their service-learning activities. Moreover, roughly 61% of College A survey respondents and 38% of College B survey respondents had been involved in projects that lasted two or more semesters. Reflecting the fact that service-learning is relatively new at College C, only one survey respondent from this institution had taught four or more service-learning courses. However, given the strong support for service-learning among instructors and administrators at College C, there was also potential for a sustained commitment at this institution in the future.

## **Discussion**

Using a case study approach, we assessed service-learning's sustainability at three colleges from the perspective of faculty members. We specifically investigated instructors' views on support for service-learning at their respective institutions and the extent to which individual faculty members have demonstrated a sustained commitment to service-learning. At all three institutions, there were limited financial incentives for instructors to adopt service-learning, and the few available financial incentives were primarily funded by external sources, rather than through institutional resources. In addition, the three colleges offered minimal opportunities for course releases. There was greater variation among institutions, however, in perceived faculty and administrative support, as well as in the availability of support services. Perceived faculty and administrator support for service-learning was strong at College C but more moderate at Colleges A and B. On the other hand, Colleges A and B had a moderate level of support services, while support services were more limited at College C. Views on

the value of service-learning in personnel review processes also varied. The attitudes of instructors at College A regarding consideration of service-learning in personnel review processes were more negative than those at Colleges B and C. Finally, there were differences in the extent of instructors' success in creating and sustaining service-learning opportunities for their students. Service-learning was a relatively new instructional tool at College C. In contrast, a small number of instructors at both Colleges A and B had used service-learning for a number of years. Although service-learning was not a widespread practice at either College A or B, the individual instructors with service-learning experience demonstrated a sustained commitment to this pedagogical approach.

This study's research design offers some important advantages. The mixed methods approach yielded rich qualitative data that provided insights into the survey findings. The interview format may have made it easier to discuss some sensitive issues involved in this study because interviewers could personally guarantee informants' confidentiality.

### **Limitations of the Study**

Although this study's research design has some benefits, it also has limitations. The generalizability of the findings may be limited because the study focused solely on service-learning's sustainability at three institutions located in the same geographic region. However, since the three colleges serve very different populations, concerns about external validity may be minimized.

### **Implications for Future Research**

The study findings have several important implications. First, the case studies are consistent with other research and illustrate that context matters. Religious institutions may be particularly receptive to service-learning due to the emphasis many of these institutions place on service. This may help explain the rapid diffusion of service-learning among full-time faculty at College C. At religious institutions, service-learning may be one of many mechanisms used to help students serve surrounding communities. These findings are consistent with research by Holland (1997) indicating that institutions with a religious affiliation demonstrate higher levels of institutional commitment to service more quickly than their secular counterparts. College C's small size may have also helped facilitate the rapid diffusion of service-learning on this campus. Future research should continue to explore the impact that

both religious affiliation and institutional size may have on service-learning implementation.

In addition, context matters when considering how faculty view the value placed on service-learning activities in personnel review processes. College A was the only institution where a large percentage of instructors disagreed that service-learning was valued in personnel review processes. It was also the only institution where faculty had substantial research expectations. These findings, which correspond with conclusions by Abes et al. (2002), suggest that personnel review processes may more likely be viewed as a barrier to sustaining service-learning efforts at institutions where research productivity is prioritized. More research is needed on whether the extent to which personnel review processes are viewed as a barrier to service-learning varies across different types of institutions. According to Bloomgarden and O'Meara (2007), it will be easier for faculty who link community-based projects with their research and teaching to sustain their community activities. Research universities interested in promoting service-learning may want to assist faculty in integrating service-learning with their research agenda, so that these activities ultimately lead to publication. Institutions that implement different strategies encouraging faculty to incorporate service-learning into their research should carefully track the efficacy of these strategies and publish the results on this research in order to enhance knowledge about best practices.

### **Faculty-Level Recommendations**

Also based on this study's findings, institutions may want to encourage mentoring relationships to provide support to instructors new to service-learning. While none of the institutions in this study had an effective campus-wide coordination mechanism, informal mentoring networks among instructors had developed at both Colleges B and C. Many interviewees indicated that mentors can serve as valuable information resources and help with problem solving. Scholars have emphasized the importance of having a centralized office for coordinating service-learning activities (*Bringle & Hatcher, 1996, 2000; Bringle et al., 1997*). However, supporting an effective centralized coordinating unit requires a substantial institutional monetary investment. When institutional resources are not available for centralized coordination, these findings suggest that informal support, such as the development of mentoring relationships, may effectively fill some of the void left by a lack of formal support services. This strategy may be particularly viable at smaller colleges where the environment is more intimate and coordination across different academic departments is less complicated.

## **Recommendations for Institutional Responses**

Although faculty support was identified as particularly helpful for instructors new to service-learning, it may be less important for veteran service-learning instructors. Instead, we identify supportive campus administrators as a key factor encouraging instructors to continue their service-learning efforts. Public declarations promoting service-learning, however, are not sufficient to convince many instructors that campus administrators are truly supportive and that their use of this teaching approach will be rewarded. At the one institution where there was a consensus among instructors that campus administrators were encouraging, one campus administrator had served as a champion for service-learning. He played a central role in securing grant funding and personally supported instructors in their service-learning activities.

In addition to support from campus administrators, we found that campus support services can motivate instructors to continue to use service-learning. However, the *presence* of support services does not necessarily mean that faculty members know they are available. Many instructors at College A were unaware of available support services, suggesting that some institutions may need more effective dissemination of information. Universities interested in encouraging the use of service-learning may want to specifically focus on providing support services that educate faculty on how to most effectively present their service-learning activities in personnel review processes. Other important institutional factors encouraging instructors to sustain their service-learning efforts identified by this research include providing funding and release time to support service-learning activities and valuing service-learning in personnel review processes.

## **The Importance of Individual Instructor Commitment**

Finally, our findings have implications regarding the support necessary to implement service-learning, as well as instructional innovations in general. As highlighted in our conceptual framework, Kozma (1985) emphasizes that instructional innovations reflect the attitudes and beliefs of the adopting faculty and require support to be effectively implemented. Our findings are generally consistent with Kozma's assertions; however, our study does suggest that individual instructors who are ideologically committed to a particular instructional innovation like service-learning may be able to demonstrate a sustained commitment to that innovation, even absent a high level of institutional support. Support for

service-learning could be strengthened in a variety of areas at Colleges A and B. Nonetheless, the vast majority of survey respondents at these two institutions believed that service-learning offers valuable educational benefits and that it is important for colleges to work with communities to help them solve problems. Reflecting their ideological support for service-learning, many instructors among the small cadre of faculty who use service-learning at Colleges A and B had taught several service-learning courses and had been involved in service-learning projects that lasted multiple semesters. Many instructors had also worked closely with community partners to design and implement service-learning projects.

Among instructors using service-learning at Colleges A and B, the lack of institutional support did not seem to inhibit their sustained commitment to this innovation. However, it is unknown how many other instructors at these two institutions had been discouraged from using service-learning at least partially due to the lack of institutional support. In the future, will more faculty become involved with service-learning at these institutions, or will instructor involvement plateau without the influx of additional resources and support? More research is needed on how individual instructor commitment to service-learning can be translated into strong commitment at an institutional level. A greater understanding of these processes will be valuable to institutions interested in creating environments conducive to sustaining service-learning.

## **Conclusion**

This article presents the results of an examination of faculty views of support for service-learning at their respective institutions. Past research on service-learning institutionalization has tended to focus on larger research universities. The institutions included in this study varied in their size, mission, and culture. This article suggests that organizational characteristics can influence faculty members' experiences with service-learning. Specifically, religious affiliation, institutional size, and institutional emphasis on research may influence efforts to sustain service-learning. The findings also suggest that informal support such as mentoring faculty new to service-learning can complement more formalized forms of institutional support. Finally, our findings highlight the critical role that individual instructor commitment can play in sustaining service-learning.

## References

Abes, E. S., Jackson, G., & Jones, S. R. (2002). Factors that motivate and deter faculty use of service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 9, 5–17.

Banerjee, M., & Hausafus, C. O. (2007). Faculty use of service-learning: Perceptions, motivations, and impediments for the human sciences. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 14, 32–45.

Billig, S. H. (2002). Adoption, implementation, and sustainability of K-12 service-learning. In A. Furco & S. H. Billig (Eds.), *Service-learning: The essence of the pedagogy* (pp. 245–267). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Bloomgarden, A. H., & O'Meara, K. A. (2007). Faculty role integration and community engagement: Harmony or cacophony? *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 13, 5–18.

Bringle, R., & Hatcher, J. (1995). A service-leaning curriculum for faculty. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 2, 112–122.

Bringle, R., & Hatcher, J. (1996). Implementing service learning in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 67, 221–239.

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (2000). Institutionalization of service learning in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71, 273–290.

Bringle, R. G., Hatcher, J. A., & Games, R. (1997). Engaging and supporting faculty in service learning. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, 2, 43–51.

Butin, D. W. (2006). Disciplining service learning: Institutionalization and the case for community studies. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 18(1), 57–64.

Campus Compact. (2009). 2009 annual membership survey results: Executive summary. Retrieved from [http://www.compact.org/wp-content/uploads/2008/11/2009\\_CC\\_Annual\\_Survey\\_Exec\\_Summary.pdf](http://www.compact.org/wp-content/uploads/2008/11/2009_CC_Annual_Survey_Exec_Summary.pdf)

Casey, K. M., & Springer, N. C. (2006). Ancillary to integral: Momentum to institutionalize service-learning and civic engagement. In K. M. Casey, G. Davidson, S. H. Billig, & N. C. Springer (Eds.), *Advancing knowledge in service-learning: Research to transform the field* (pp. 207–222). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Clark, T. (1993). Attitudes of higher education faculty toward distance education: A national survey. *The American Journal of Distance Education*, 7, 19–33.

Cuban, S., & Anderson, J. (2007). Where's the justice in service-learning? Institutionalizing service-learning from a social justice perspective at a Jesuit university. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 40, 144–155.

Driscoll, A. (2000). Studying faculty and service-learning: Directions for inquiry and development. *Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning, Special Issue*, 35–41.

Foertsch, J., Millar, S. B., Squire, L., & Gunter, R. (1997). *Persuading professors: A study of the dissemination of educational reform in research institutions*. Washington, DC: National Science Foundation's Directorate of Education and Human Resources, Division of Research, Evaluation, and Communication.

Forbes, B. A., Wasburn, M. A., Crispo, A. W., & Vandever, R. C. (2008). Teaching service-learning: What's in it for faculty at research universities. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 12, 29–44.

Friedman, C. P. (1982). Factors affecting adoption of instructional innovations: An example from medical education. *Research in Higher Education*, 16, 291–302.

Furco, A. (2002a). Institutionalizing service learning in higher education. *The Journal of Public Affairs*, 1, 39–68.

Furco, A. (2002b). *Self-assessment rubric for the institutionalization of service-learning in higher education*. Berkeley, CA: University of California.

Hannan, A., & Silver, H. (2000). *Innovating in higher education: Teaching, learning, and institutional cultures*. Buckingham, UK, and Philadelphia, PA: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Hinck, S. S., & Brandell, M. E. (2000). The relationship between institutional support and campus acceptance of academic service learning. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 43, 868–881.

Holland, B. (1997). Analyzing institutional commitment to service: A model of key organizational factors. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 4, 30–41.

Holland, B. A. (1999). Factors and strategies that influence faculty involvement in public service. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, 4(1), 37–43.

Holland, B. A. (2006). *Levels of commitment to community engagement, characterized by key organizational factors evidencing relevance to institutional mission* [Matrix]. Retrieved November 9, 2007, from <http://www.hen-ceonline.org/resources/institutional>

Ikenberry, S. (1972). The organizational dilemma. *Journal of Higher Education*, 43, 23–34.

Kozma, R. B. (1985). A grounded theory of instructional innovation in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 56(3), 300–319.

Kramer, M. (2000). *Make it last forever: The institutionalization of service learning in America*. Washington, DC: Corporation for National Service.

Lane, J. L. (2001). *Teaching and learning innovations in higher education: Faculty perceptions of sustainability* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA.

Levine, M.A. (1994). Seven steps to getting faculty involved in service learning: How a traditional faculty member came to teach a course on “voluntarism, community, and citizenship.” *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 1, 110-114.

McKay, V. C., & Rozee, P. D. (2004). Characteristics of faculty who adopt community service learning pedagogy. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 11, 21–33.

Mercer, D.K., & Brungardt, C. (2007). Case study: Institutionalizing service-learning at Fort Hays University. *National Civic Review*, 96, 52-54.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, M. A. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Penberthy, D. L., & Millar, S. B. (2002). The “hands-off” as a flawed approach to disseminating innovation: Lessons from chemistry. *Innovative Higher Education*, 26, 251–270.

Stanton, T. (1994). The experience of faculty participants in an instructional development seminar on service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 1, 7–20.

Stater, K. J., & Fotheringham, E. (2009). Mechanisms for institutionalizing service-learning and community partner outcomes. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 13, 7–30.

Stoecker, R., & Tryon, E. A. (2009). *The unheard voices: Community organizations and service learning*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Tierney, W. G. (1997). Organizational socialization in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 68, 1–16.

Ward, K. (1998). *Addressing academic culture: Service-learning, organizations, and faculty work*. In R. Rhoads & J. Howard (Eds.), *Academic service learning: A pedagogy of action and reflection* (pp. 73–80). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Zlotkowski, E. (2000). Service learning and the engaged department: A strategy with many uses. In Ann F. Lucas (Ed.), *Leading academic change: Essential roles for department chairs* (pp. 195–214). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

## About the Authors

**Kristina T. Lambright** is an assistant professor of public administration at Binghamton University’s College of Community and Public Affairs. Her research interests include service-learning, engaged scholarship, contracting, monitoring social service delivery systems, and organizational performance. Lambright earned her bachelor’s degree from Dartmouth College and her master’s degree and Ph.D. in public administration from Syracuse University.

**Allison F. Alden** is the founding director of Binghamton University’s Center for Civic Engagement. Her research interests include organizational collaborations, community development, service-learning, and engaged scholarship. Alden earned her bachelor’s degree in Anthropology, her master’s degree in Social Studies Education, and her Ed.D. in theory to practice from the school of education at Binghamton University.

## **Appendix I. Survey Instrument**

For the purposes of this survey, service-learning is defined as:

A form of experiential education characterized by ALL of the following conditions: student participation in an ORGANIZED SERVICE ACTIVITY that meets identified OFF-CAMPUS COMMUNITY NEEDS and is connected to COURSE CONTENT and SPECIFIC LEARNING OUTCOMES with STRUCTURED REFLECTION DURING CLASS TIME (modified definition from Abes, Jackson, and Jones, 2002).

For questions 1–10, please indicate the extent to which you agree with the statements below using the following scale:

- 1 = Strongly disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Neither agree nor disagree
- 4 = Agree
- 5 = Strongly agree

**For all survey respondents.**

1. Service-learning is a valuable pedagogical tool.	1	2	3	4	5
2. It is important for students ON THIS CAMPUS to participate in service-learning.	1	2	3	4	5
3. It is important for students IN MY DISCIPLINE to participate in service-learning as part of their training.	1	2	3	4	5
4. It is important for colleges and universities to work with communities to help them solve problems.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Other instructors IN MY DEPARTMENT are supportive of service-learning.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Instructors OUTSIDE MY DEPARTMENT are supportive of service-learning.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Campus administrators are supportive of service-learning.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Support services for instructors interested in service-learning are available on this campus.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Campus funding for service-learning activities is available.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Service-learning activities are valued in performance reviews and/or the tenure and promotion process on this campus.	1	2	3	4	5

11. How relevant is service-learning to your research agenda?

- Not at all relevant
- Somewhat relevant
- Very relevant
- Not applicable

12. How many times have you taught a semester-long class with a service-learning component?

- 0
- 1-3
- 4-6
- 7-9
- 10 or more

13. What is your faculty rank?

- Full professor
- Associate professor
- Assistant professor
- Adjunct professor
- Lecturer/instructor

14. What is your tenure status?

- Tenured
- Untenured, on tenure track
- Untenured, not on tenure track

15. In which academic discipline do you currently teach?

- Humanities
- Social & behavioral sciences
- Physical & biological sciences
- Math, engineering, computer science, technology
- Business
- Social work, education, human ecology, agriculture
- Arts
- Health professions
- Religious instruction
- Other

16. At which institution do you currently teach?

- College A
- College B
- College C

17. How many years have you been teaching at the college/university level? \_\_\_\_\_

18. What is your gender?

- Male
- Female

19. What is your race/ethnicity? Please select one.

- African-American
- American Indian/Alaskan Native
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- Caucasian
- Hispanic
- Multiracial
- Other

**Only for instructors who taught a service-learning course.** Only individuals who selected a choice other than "0" for question 12 were asked the following survey questions.

20. What types of course have you taught that fit our definition of service-learning? Check all that apply.

- Practicum
- Capstone project
- Internship
- Other type of course
- Other (please specify)

21. How many service-learning projects have you been involved in that have lasted TWO OR MORE SEMESTERS?

- 0
- 1-3
- 4-6
- 7-9
- 10 or more

22. How many community organizations have you partnered with as part of your service-learning activities?

- 0
- 1-3
- 4-6
- 7-9
- 10 or more

23. What funding have you received to support your service-learning activities? Please check all that apply.

- I have never received funding to support my service-learning activities.
- College/university funding
- External funding

24. Have you received release time to support your service-learning activities?

- Yes
- No

For questions 25–29, please indicate the extent to which you agree with the statements below using the following scale:

1 = Strongly disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neither agree nor disagree

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly agree

25. My community partners have had input in the DEVELOPMENT of my service-learning projects.	1	2	3	4	5
26. My community partners have had input in the IMPLEMENTATION of my service-learning projects.	1	2	3	4	5
27. I regard my community partners as co-instructors in my courses with a service-learning component.	1	2	3	4	5
28. My community partners have provided me with feedback about my service-learning projects following project completion.	1	2	3	4	5
29. I have maintained communication with my community partners following completion of the service-learning projects in which the partners were involved.	1	2	3	4	5

## **Appendix 2. First Interview Protocol**

### *Faculty Implementation*

1. How widespread is the practice of service-learning among the faculty on this campus?  
Provide specific examples.
2. Which faculty members provide leadership for service-learning on the campus?

### *Faculty Incentives*

3. In what ways are faculty encouraged and/or rewarded by the campus for engaging in service-learning?
4. How seriously are community-based learning and service-learning activities considered in the review, promotion, and tenure or performance/contract reviews of faculty?  
Provide specific examples.
5. To what extent do “official” campus policies for promotion, review, and tenure or performance/contract reviews address service-learning?

### *Centralized Support Capacity*

6. What is the coordinating agent for service-learning on the campus?
7. What percentage of all service-learning activities on the campus are coordinated, monitored, and/or filtered through this coordinating agent?
8. In terms of the status of their position, how much authority does the service-learning staff have to influence the advancement and institutionalization of service-learning on the campus?
9. What formal policies exist on your campus regarding service-learning? Provide specific examples.

### *Macro-Level Anchors*

10. What are the primary components of the strategic plan for advancing service-learning on this campus?
11. What are the short- and long-range goals for service-learning on this campus?
12. With which campus-wide efforts is service-learning connected?

### *Institutionalization of Service-Learning*

13. How is service-learning financially supported on this campus? What are the sources of funding (hard money, soft money, etc.)?
14. How have the chief administrators supported the advancement and/or institutionalization of service-learning on this campus? Provide specific examples.
15. How is the quality of this campus’s service-learning activities monitored?

### *Follow-up for Document Analysis*

What documents, websites, or other sources can you recommend that provide some explanations and details that may pertain to service-learning on your campus?

### **Appendix 3. Second Interview Protocol**

1. How did you first become involved in service-learning?
2. How widespread is the practice of service-learning among the faculty on this campus?
3. In what ways are faculty encouraged and/or rewarded by the campus for engaging in service-learning?
4. How supportive of service-learning are other instructors in your department? Provide specific examples.
5. How supportive of service-learning are instructors outside of your department? Provide specific examples.
6. How supportive of service-learning are campus administrators? Provide specific examples.
7. To what extent are support services available on this campus for instructors interested in service-learning?
8. Have you received funding to support your service-learning activities? If so, from where did you receive this funding and how much funding did you receive? To what extent did this funding encourage you to continue to use service-learning?
9. Have you received release time to support your service-learning activities? If so, how much release time? How was it paid for? To what extent did this release time encourage you to continue to use service-learning?
10. How seriously are community-based learning and service-learning activities considered in the review, promotion, and tenure or performance/contract reviews of faculty? How does this impact faculty decisions to participate in service-learning?
11. Explain the relevance of service-learning to your research agenda.
12. Describe the role that your community partners have typically played in your service-learning projects. How, if at all, would you like to expand the role of your community partners?
13. Do you plan to continue to use service-learning in the future? Why or why not?
14. (Only for faculty planning to continue to use service-learning in the future) What, if anything, might prevent you from using service-learning in the future?
15. What advice would you give regarding service-learning to a new faculty member just starting out? Why?

